

# The Charlotte Journal.

"Perpetual Vigilance is the Price of Liberty," for "Power is always Stealing from the Many to the Few."

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.  
AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOLUME XX.

CHARLOTTE, N. C. JULY 17, 1850.

NUMBER 33.

Letter of Hon. Waddy Thompson.  
To the Editor of the *Charlotte Journal*:

Sir:—You have published, in a late number of your paper, a letter from your Washington correspondent, containing some ill-considered personal animadversions upon me, in regard to a letter of mine recently published, on the subject of the admission of California and other kindred measures. It is not my habit to notice anonymous attacks upon me, for the course my judgment has dictated upon questions of public policy. But your paper circulates among my constituents—those who first introduced me to the public service, and who always sustained me with an unflinching confidence and disinterested regard, which few public men have enjoyed. I can imagine few calamities which would distress me as much as loss of that confidence, and I therefore ask of you, in a spirit of justice, the publication of my letter, and of the additional remarks which I now send you. I have been assisted in your paper, and I cannot anticipate that you will refuse me this simple justice. From the want of ability I suppose, to discuss the great questions involved, your correspondent has resorted to personal vituperation—and I have found nothing more to say of me than that I was two years absent in Mexico—and that, since my return, I was also absent from the State, for a few months in the year, engaged in professional duties here. As to the first, I have only to say that your readers will decide how I discharged the duties of the trust confided to me, and he knows very little of the human heart who does not know that such an absence increases, instead of diminishing, the love of one's native land—much South Carolina is to me. Can you say as much for yourself or your correspondent? Do either of you love South Carolina as much as you do your native land? I would say to you, I should either doubt the statement, or think the less of you, if it were true. Allow me to add, and I do it in a disinterested spirit, that all my family and my immediate kindred are permanently resident in that State, and must largely share in whatever evil may befall it. Can you say as much for yourself or your correspondent? These allusions to matters purely personal are not agreeable to me, but they are forced upon me by a personal attack—well directed in matters of much more importance. When I wrote the letter alluded to, I was not aware of the assaults to which it exposed me, and how defenceless I was with the undivided press of the State opposed to my views. It was painful to me to advocate measures which were opposed to the views of the President, for whom I entertained a sincere respect and esteem, and still more so to run a thwart the public opinion of the enlightened and patriotic people, amongst whom, thus far, my life has been, and with whom the remainder of it will be passed. If I had looked to office—there were the only two quarters to which my views would have been directed—and I may therefore defy the agency and malignity of your correspondent to find any motive, but one which is honorable and patriotic. My life has not been without examples of defiance of the most terrific thing to an ambitious and selfish man, the torrent of an erring public opinion. I will only add that, notwithstanding a very warm friendship and high admiration for Mr. Clay, there is no public man with whom I have more frequently differed in opinion on questions of public policy—the Bank, the tariff, and Distribution, for example—and I may add that I refused my assent to his resolutions as first offered.

The questions now involved are: First, The admission of California. This is purely a question of expediency, not of constitutional power. In this opinion I am sustained, to say nothing of others, by Judge Stanley, the President of the Nashville Convention, second to no man in the South for devotion to its interests and for eminent professional reputation. There is nothing in the Constitution, which requires that a State should pass through the purgatory of a Territorial Government, as a requisite to admission into the Union. The term "Territorial Government" is not found in the Constitution—such governments having existed in an anomaly in our system, which has resulted from the fact that the people inhabiting a particular portion of our country must have a government, and their number was not large enough to constitute a State. If the Presidents had been different, these would have constituted a ground of objection to a constitutional power. But such is not the fact. Kentucky, Vermont, and Texas, were admitted without having passed through Territorial Governments, and I assert the fact that in no instance has any State had a Territorial Government, which had a population sufficiently large to constitute a State. If then there is no constitutional question involved, can I, on the subject of California to a Territorial Government. Is there a y one of decent intelligence, who supposes that she will not present herself at the next session with a constitution containing the same provision as to slavery—what then shall we have gained?—nothing; but, by a most natural irritation of the people of that State to array them against the slaveholding interest in the Confederal Union. I would ask those who are so urgent for this course, how long they would require the territorial condition—one year, three months, three days? And are great questions, like those now under consideration, to be affected by such miserable sophisms and empty abstractions? That California, if not now admitted, will persist in the same provision in her Constitution, is

proved by the fact that the Convention was unanimous as to that question—and a majority of the members of that Convention were from the Slaveholding States. But it is said that the limits of the States are too large. That, to me, is the very strongest argument in favor of its admission. I wish those limits had included the whole of the country acquired from Mexico, except that given to Texas. The only department of the government, in which any power is left to the South, is the Senate. That power is constantly diminishing, and the Southern man incurs no light responsibility who seeks to cut up California into more States than one, and thus to increase the vote of the non-slaveholding States in the Senate. I do not hesitate, therefore, to say that I prefer the measures proposed to the Missouri Compromise. First, Because the Missouri Compromise reasserts the right of Congress to impose a legislative restriction. This is done as of factually, so far as principle is concerned, by applying such a restriction to one half of the territory as to all of it—and I confess that I cannot understand how any man, who believes the exercise of such a power is not warranted by the Constitution, which he has sworn to support, can vote for it. So thought Mr. Calhoun; and he said that, although he would submit to it, he could not vote for it.

Secondly, I prefer it because the Missouri compromise will give two free States on the Pacific and four Senators, instead of one free State and two Senators. Slavery can never be carried to the lower portion of California. That country consists, for the most part, of swamp and sand banks. Its agricultural capabilities will never support the population of a State. But it is said there is gold there—none has been discovered yet. But, it is replied, it will be. So may the diamond—but neither has been found yet. If it is, slavery cannot go there. No sane man would take slaves there surrounded on one side by non-slaveholding Mexico, with which country we have no treaty of extradition, and non-slaveholding California on the other. Slaves are almost valueless on the Ohio frontier of Kentucky. How much greater would be the insecurity in California, a vast wilderness, and occupied, not by steady and law-abiding farmers, but exclusively by miners. I believe that it is true now, if it has been true since the discovery of gold, that no civil process could be served in the miners' town of Galena; because the people will not permit it. But then, again, the right of the Kentuckian is admitted and indisputable. Not so in California; for, if the Missouri compromise line is adopted, there will be no express legislation on the subject, but the law left as it is, and that may, at least, be regarded as a doubtful legal question, when nine-tenths of the lawyers of the country think that slavery does not now exist by law in that country.

The next question is as to the organization of Territorial Governments in Utah and New Mexico. It is asked what does the South gain? I answer every thing which we have ever contended for. What has been the question so fiercely agitated between the North and South ever since the Missouri controversy? Why, the right of Congress to impose a restriction as to slavery? That is conceded to us by the refusal to exercise the power, and that, too, after an issue regularly made and made up between the two sections. But this is not all. There is a provision in the bill that the Territorial Legislature shall not pass any law establishing or prohibiting slavery. That is to say, the law shall remain as it now is. How is that? Why, as Mr. Calhoun thought, and as all South Carolina thought, slavery exists there now by law. What more can be asked than that the law shall not be abrogated? This was the ground taken by Mr. Calhoun two years ago, and reasserted during the present session. If any public man or press in this State has ever expressed a doubt upon this question I am ignorant of it. I well know that there is a certain class of politicians who breathe a little freer since the death of that distinguished man, and begin to realize the right, as well as the necessity, to think for themselves. But I would submit to them whether it is not a little irreverent so soon to controvert a position which he had so deeply deliberated and so ably discussed, or, in very good taste, now to express opposite opinions. Such was not only the undivided opinion of the State, but it was precisely for holding the opposite opinion that Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, a man of whom it may be truly said—"as Cato firm, as Aristides just"—received a very offensive sobriquet.

If he was right in his opinion, he rendered an eminent service in moving to lay the Clayton Compromise on the table—for in that case that Compromise yielded every thing. In one word, if slavery now exists by law in New Mexico, the bill before the Senate not only secures it from disturbance from Congress, but also from Territorial Legislation. Sir, in this connection, I beg leave to say that I cannot comprehend how it is that the men, who were the zealous advocates of the Clayton Compromise, are now found in opposition to the bill before the Senate. That bill secures all that the Clayton Compromise did, and much more, as I will proceed to show. The Clayton Compromise contained no congressional restriction—neither does the present bill—but has left that question where alone it properly belongs to the people of California. That measure provided that no laws should be passed in New Mexico prohibiting or establishing slavery, leaving the laws, on that subject as they are, and submit the legal question to the Supreme Court.

So does the present bill, with this most important additional concession, that a portion of that country, nine hundred miles in length, and the only portion possessing any real value, is taken out of the jurisdiction of the Court, and given to Texas as a slaveholding State—so that thus to the slaveholding interest this law is a gift of country, with the privilege of resorting to litigation for the balance.

The Texas feature of the bill gives to the State of Texas a territory of nine hundred miles in extent on the Rio Grande, and makes it slave territory in the only way in which it can be done; and, that portion, too, of the territory where slave property can be carried, because there alone it can be profitably employed. If this settlement is not made, the question must be submitted to judicial decision, and the immensely preponderating weight of the opinions of the most eminent lawyers is that the decision will be adverse. Ought not the South then to accede to the Compromise—would not any prudent man do so in the circumstances?

I have not discussed the two other questions—the breaking up of those odious and loathsome establishments the private negro jails in the District, which I should feel myself to know were not as offensive to Southern men as Northern men; nor the portion of the bill relating to fugitive slaves. It is objected to this that it gives the right of trial by jury to a slave claiming his freedom. My only objection to this provision is, that it is a repulsive legislation, as precisely that right already exists in every Slave State. This part of the bill is satisfactory to the States of Maryland and Kentucky, which have the greatest interest in it, and whose people are as apt as any others to understand their rights, and are as ready to vindicate them.

I have thus far presented an outline, and only an outline, of my views on these important questions. I hope, and believe, with much confidence, that, if these measures are adopted, Abolition will have received its death-blow. It may linger for a time, but I confidently believe that it will soon be entombed with Anti-Masonry and other like fungi, which must always be expected to grow for a season upon a body politic like ours. But if in this I am deceived, and aggressions are made upon other points, our people will be united in resistance—and thus united we need fear no power. I do not, I confess, think that while I honor even in their excesses that high spirit and uncalculating determination to resist wrong and injustice, yet considering as I do the point of honor solved, I should regard as a great calamity to the South any effort to resist wrongs real or supposed. Such a failure would prove a fatal blow to the power of the South. If these measures are not adopted, the condition in which we shall find ourselves will be that California will be admitted, and no government given to New Mexico and Utah. Will that state of things present an issue which will unite the South in resistance? My life upon it, not a State in the Union, except our own will come up to such an issue.

We shall then have neither a settlement nor an issue. Precisely the state of things which the abolitionists desire—California admitted as a State and the Territorial question left open for continued agitation—by the fanatics of that party, and the still more desperate portion of it—those who are in consequence only from this agitation, and seek to profit still more by its continuance. It is worthy of remark that every abolitionist in Congress is opposed to this adjustment, and it is a most strange thing to see the antislavery men, with opinions and feelings so hostile, acting in such perfect concert.

All that we shall have accomplished will be an exhibition of high courage which no one doubts, and that we value the Union less than the maintenance of our rights, which is as little doubted. The courage of a nation is not that of a duellist. But a much more cautious, wise and deliberative quality. I am not aware that the Irish rebellion of '48 or the more recent one, has advanced the cause of Irish liberty.

I know very well that these opinions are not those of the State. I should lean to that opinion more readily if it had been formed after hearing both sides. But, with the exception of one or two short articles in the *Charlotte Courier*, I believe that no argument has been published in the State. That public opinion of the Editors of newspapers and a few politicians. If the masses have made up an opinion it has not been done upon sufficient investigation. To such a public opinion, with all proper respect for those respectable classes of gentlemen, I cannot surrender my own. I want public office my course is to say the least, disinterested, as I am opposing those from whom alone I can obtain it. If I do not, it is no less so. There is no community in the world whose good opinion I so much desire as that of the people of South Carolina. There is no sacrifice which I would not make for the respect of that enlightened and patriotic people, except that of my respect for myself, which I should do, if I could, on great issues like those now before us, to assemble my opinions, or shrink from their free expression. In conclusion, I will only say, that I rely confidently upon time, that sure test of truth, for the vindication of these opinions.

Very respectfully, your obt. servt.,  
WADDY THOMPSON.

Why is a silk hat like a counterfeit passion?  
Ans. Because it is not felt.

A small fog is a petty fog, but a small lawyer is a pettifogger.

## An Army of Monkeys. A Novel Suspension Bridge.

"They are coming towards the bridge; they will most likely cross by the rocks yonder," observed Raoul.

"How—swim it?" I asked. "It is a torrent there!"

"Oh, no," answered the Frenchman; "monkeys would rather go into fire than water. If they cannot leap the stream, they will bridge it."

"Bridge it! and how?"

"Stop a moment Captain—you shall see." The half human voices now sounded nearer, and we could perceive that the animals were approaching the spot where we lay. Presently they appeared upon the opposite bank, headed by an old grey chieftain and followed like so many soldiers. They were, as Raoul stated, of the *comandria* or ringtailed tribe.

On an aide-de-camp, or chief pioneer, perhaps—ran out upon a projecting rock, and, after looking across the stream as if calculating the distance, scampered back and appeared to communicate with the leader. This produced a movement in the troop. Commands were issued and fatigue parties were detailed and marched to the front. Meanwhile several of the *comandria*—engineers, no doubt—ran along the bank, examining the trees on both sides of the arroyo.

At length they all collected around a tall cottonwood, that grew over the narrowest part of the stream, and 20 or 30 of them scampered up its trunk. On reaching a high point the foremost—a strong fellow—ran out upon a limb, and taking several turns of his tail around it, slipped off and hung head downwards. The next on the limb, also a stout one, climbed down the body of the first, and whopped his tail tightly round the neck and forearm of the latter, dropped off in his turn, and hung head down. The third repeated these operations upon the second, and the fourth upon the third, and so on, until the last one upon the string rested his fore paws upon the ground.

The living chain now commenced swinging backwards and forwards, like the pendulum of a clock. The motion was slight at first, but gradually increased, the lowermost monkey striking his hands violently on the earth as he passed the tangent of the oscillating curve. Several others upon the limbs above aided the movement.

This continued until the monkey at the end of the chain was thrown among the branches of a tree on the opposite bank. Here, after two or three vibrations, he clutched a limb and held fast. This movement was executed suddenly, just at the culminating point of the oscillation, in order to save the intermediate links from the violence of a sudden jerk!

The chain was now fast at both ends, forming a complete suspension bridge, over which the whole troop, to the number of four or five hundred passed, with the rapidity of thought.

It was one of the most comical sights I ever beheld, to witness the quizzical expression of countenances along that living chain!

The troop was now on the other side, but how were the animals forming the bridge to get themselves over? This was the question which suggested itself. Manifestly, by number one letting go his tail. But then the point d'appui on the other side was much lower down, and number one with half-a-dozen of his neighbors, would be dashed against the opposite bank, or soaked into the water.

Here, then, was a problem, and we waited with some curiosity for its solution. It was soon solved. A monkey was now seen attach his tail to the lowest on the bridge, and another, and so on, until a dozen more were added to the string. These last were all powerful fellows; and, running up to a high limb, they lifted the bridge into a position almost horizontal.

Then a scream from the last monkey of the new formation warned the tail end that all was ready; and the next moment the whole chain was swung over, and landed safely on the opposite bank. The lowermost links now dropped off like a melting candle, while the higher ones leaped to the branches and came down by the trunk. The whole troop then scampered off into the chapparal and disappeared!—[Capt. Reid's *Adventures in South America*.]

## A FAMILY BROIL.

The Burlington Free Press thinks that the best way to get up a "family broil" is to buy a good ham.

A man cannot possess anything that is better than a good woman, or anything that is worse than a bad one.

## Plank Road Convention.

The delegates to the Plank Road Convention assembled in the Court House, on Saturday, the 22d of June, at one o'clock, P. M., and on motion of Mr. Shuford, of Catawba, John Coulter, Esq., of Lincoln, was called to the chair, and M. L. McCorkle, of Catawba, and Robt. Williamson of Lincoln, were requested to act as Secretaries.

On motion, the counties were called, and the names of the following delegates enrolled:

Catawba—D. B. Gaither, Andrew H. Shuford, Col. A. Hard, Philip Pitts, Q. A. Shuford, M. L. McCorkle, Henry Walford, Oscar Reid, Jacob Shuford, E. P. Coulter, Abel H. Shuford, Daniel Loretz, L. B. Higley, Capt. W. Bradburn.

Lincoln—Dr. Alexander Ramsour, A. F. Brevard, Maxwell Warlick, A. P. Canster, Daniel Lures, J. Ramsour, (M. W.) J. Ramsour, Smit, J. A. Ramsour, B. S. Johnston, L. E. Thompson, Henry Canster, J. T. Alexander.

Mecklenburg—Dr. C. J. Fox and Gen. J. A. Young.

Gaston—When Gaston County was called, Mr. R. M. Alexander rose and stated, that that county had failed to hold a meeting and appoint delegates, but that he and Mr. F. I. Hoffman, feeling a great interest in the completion of the enterprise, had come to witness the deliberations of the Convention. On motion, it was resolved unanimously, that they be invited to take their seats as members.

On motion of L. E. Thompson, Esq., a committee, of two from each county, was appointed to select permanent officers for the Convention, viz: Dr. Fox and Gen. Young, of Mecklenburg; R. M. Alexander and F. I. Hoffman, of Gaston; C. C. Henderson and L. E. Thompson of Lincoln; and D. B. Gaither and Andrew H. Shuford, of Catawba.

Who, after a short retirement, returned and recommended the following:

For President, C. C. Henderson, Esq., of Lincoln.

For Vice President, John Coulter, Esq., of Lincoln.

For Corresponding Secretaries, M. L. McCorkle, Robt. Williamson, R. M. Alexander and J. A. Young.

The recommendation of the Committee was unanimously concurred in.

On motion, the following rule was adopted:

Upon all questions arising in the Convention, each county represented shall be entitled to one vote.

On motion of L. E. Thompson, Esq., a Committee of four, one from each county, was appointed to prepare resolutions for the action of the convention. The chair named the following gentlemen: Dr. Fox, L. E. Thompson, R. M. Alexander and Andrew H. Shuford, Esq.

Who, after retiring, returned and submitted the following report, which was adopted—every county voting in the affirmative:

"The Committee appointed to prepare resolutions for the consideration of the convention, submitted the following:

1. Resolved, That we will build a Plank Road from Charlotte, Mecklenburg county, by way of Lincoln, to Newton, Catawba county.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient and proper that a special committee of four, one from each county, be appointed to prepare a charter adjusting the above object, to be submitted to the next General Assembly.

3. Resolved, That the President or Vice President, at the suggestion of any three or more delegates, shall call a meeting of the delegates at such time and place as may be deemed proper.

During the absence of the Committee, in answer to calls from all sides of the house, Gen. Young and M. L. McCorkle severally addressed the convention upon the subject of Internal Improvements in general, and in particular the usefulness and practicality of a Plank Road from Charlotte to Newton.

A motion was made by L. E. Thompson, Esq., to amend the second resolution so as to ask the General Assembly for two charters instead of one; one, for a Plank Road from Charlotte to Lincoln; the other, for a Plank Road from Lincoln to Newton. But, after a discussion, in which Mr. Thompson, Dr. Fox, A. H. Shuford and others participated, the amendment was rejected.

The President appointed the following persons to prepare the charter under the second resolution: Dr. Fox, of Mecklenburg; R. M. Alexander, of Gaston; L. E. Thompson, of Lincoln; M. L. McCorkle, of Catawba.

On motion,

Resolved, That when this Convention adjourns, it adjourn to meet in Lincoln on Tuesday of the next Court for Lincoln county.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this Convention be published in the Lincoln and Charlotte papers, and that the Raleigh papers be requested to copy them.

The Convention then adjourned.

C. C. HENDERSON, President.

JOHN COULTER, Vice President.

M. L. McCORKLE, ROBT. WILLIAMSON, R. M. ALEXANDER, J. A. YOUNG, Secretaries.

## THE PAINÉ LIGHT.

The New York Globe, on the authority of the proprietors of the Astor House, deny that they ever entered into any contract with Mr. P. for lighting that establishment with his gas. In a casual conversation with him, they told Mr. P. he might light the place if he could, and they would amply repay him for it. There the conversation ended, and Mr. Paine has never undertaken the task.—The more light there is attempted to be elicited on this subject the darker it gets.

Enjoy what little you have while the fool is looking for more.

## The Loco Foco Convention—Again.

We wish to urge upon our readers, we insist upon keeping it before the country, and we entreat our Whig friends not to lose sight of it in the present canvass—that the course of the Democrats of this State upon the question of Slavery, evinces not only the most heartless duplicity, but an entire disregard of the rights of the South. This delicate subject, so vitally affecting our peace, our interests, our rights as American citizens, has, in the turning of the Loco-foco kaleidoscope, been made to assume every phase of appearance, as party interests from time to time required. To-day, they are for forcible resistance; to-morrow they are all conciliation and for peace. At one time, they try to wheedle the Whigs into a union of councils with them in reference to this subject; at another time, they denounce all as traitors who have the sagacity to fathom the depths of their stratagems. In one of the resolutions, passed by their late Convention, they say slavery is no question of party; in another, they make war on Gen. Taylor—a Southern man and slaveholder—because he happens to have an opinion of his own on this question!

One of the resolutions passed by their Convention arraigns Gen. Taylor, as guilty of "a direct and unwarranted interference with and an attempt to forestall the action of Congress." And why, do our readers suppose, is Gen. Taylor thus arraigned? They give the reason, in the same resolution—it is for "his continued persistence in his peculiar plan," for settling this vexed question of slavery. And here again by the way, they expose themselves by another instance of double-dealing hypocrisy. To what tune have their party organs been grinding, to what note have their party jackals been barking, ever since Gen. Taylor's inauguration? Why, that he was an imbecile dotard—as pliant as a willow twig in the hands of his keepers—with no opinions of his own—so tickled with the trappings of official station, that like an eastern Sultan, he was dreaming away his life in idle repose, leaving to his viziers all the burdens of the State.—This was when it suited their policy, to represent him as a fool. And no parrot ever tried harder to repeat the vulgar epithets rife in a sailor boarding house, than has the "Standard," to pipe in tune the music of the "Union" and "Richmond Enquirer," in thus representing Gen. Taylor as too stupid to have any opinion on any political question. But now he has to be assailed from another point of attack—and lo, and behold, the pliant tool, by another turn of the kaleidoscope, is converted into an obstinate and stubborn tyrant. He will "continue to persist in his peculiar plan."

Now, we would be glad to know how this is "an attempt to forestall the action of Congress?" The Constitution requires of the President, that "he shall recommend to the consideration of Congress, such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."—In discharge of his duty, Gen. Taylor did recommend to Congress his "peculiar plan," for the adjustment of this question. We are not discussing the question with reference to the propriety or impropriety of Gen. Taylor's views. Would these very consistent and patriotic worthies, that constituted the Loco-foco Sanhedrim lately assembled here, have Gen. Taylor abandon his views—views, whether right or wrong, yet no doubt adopted after the most mature and deliberate reflection—without any change of mental conviction, but merely because a portion of his political friends may differ with him in opinion—or because it is thought a majority in Congress differ from him in opinion? Let it be borne in mind, and well-pondered on by the people, that this is the Loco-foco view of statesmanship, and of official duty, in North Carolina—deliberately matured, and solemnly put forth in a platform of political faith—that the President of the United States has no right to "persist" in an opinion, which may be in conflict with the supposed wishes of a majority in Congress. For mind you, reader, the objection to Gen. Taylor is not that he is attempting to over-awe or brow-beat Congress—not that he is prostituting his official patronage to further his views—but that he "persists" in the opinion, that his "peculiar plan" is the best under the circumstances. Shades of our fathers! has it so soon come to this? That a powerful and numerous faction, so soon after the consummation of thy glorious labors, should shamelessly avow such a slavish doctrine—that the liberty of opinion, the right of private judgment, should be thus held subordinate to party allegiance!! Even if there were no practical questions at issue between the two parties, yet it is such moral depravity as is involved in a sentiment like this, that imposes upon the Whigs of this country, the endless duty, to "fight on, fight ever."

And when, pray, did Loco-focism become the advocate and defender of Congressional independence? Is it not notoriously a portion of the history of the times, that the great question at issue between the two parties for years—that which in fact lies at the foundation of all others, is this one of Executive supremacy on the one hand, and Congressional freedom on the other? The Whigs have ever insisted upon confining Executive power within strict Constitutional limits, leaving the Representatives of the people free from Presidential influence, whether by dictation or the appliances of official patronage. The Democrats have on the other hand ever contended for Executive infallibility in construing Constitutional obligations—and that the President, as the repre-